



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 107

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1961

No. 104

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 50: 7: The Lord God will help me, therefore I shall not be confounded, and I know that I shall not be ashamed.

O Thou gracious Benefactor, to whose right and mercy there are no limits and whose blessings of love and grace fall upon all alike in impartial benediction, grant that we may be more worthy and appreciative of Thy goodness.

In our darkness Thou art our light, in our weakness Thou art our strength, in our sorrows, Thou art our consolation, and in our restlessness, Thou art our peace.

May we seek and strive eagerly and earnestly for those qualities of character which were regnant in the life of our Master and which Thou wouldst have us achieve.

Inspire us to grow in knowledge of His noble ways of thinking and living and give us a finer perception of those moral and spiritual laws by which we must govern our conduct.

Help us to hasten the dawning of that blessed day when men and nations everywhere shall hunger and thirst after righteousness and enter into the fullness of the more abundant life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7444. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of

the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. DWORSHAK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution transferring the management of the Senate restaurants to the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

BAN CUBAN MOLASSES

(Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my Louisiana colleagues who already have protested the bringing into this country of 2 million gallons of low-priced blackstrap molasses from Cuba. This molasses has been unloaded at New Orleans in Louisiana and is to be sold in competition with domestic producers of molasses and syrups. This is bad enough, but Mr. Speaker, there is no rhyme or reason for trading with this Communist dictator.

Mr. Speaker, this man Castro rose to power over the dead bodies of his compatriots. He is now the undisputed dictator of the island of Cuba. He came into power on a program of doing justice to the peons and peasants in Cuba. He has now thrown off all constitutional and legal impediments to his action in remaining in power without elections in this island to the south of us.

Mr. Speaker, this dictator has seized more than \$1 billion in American property located in the island without paying for it. He has taken American lives, violated every American idea that he could think of and repeatedly boasted of this action. He takes his orders from Moscow in Russia, is undeniably a puppet of the Russian Communist regime, he seeks to give this Nation all of the trouble which he possibly can give us in Central and South America, stirring up peoples in these areas against us and in

favor of communism. He seeks in every possible way to hinder, handicap, and destroy our Government.

AGAINST FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I polled every newspaper, radio station, and television station in South Carolina regarding Federal aid to education—a total of 180. The response was excellent. Of the 180 mailed, I received a reply from 135; 113 opposed Federal aid to education, 18 were for Federal aid, and 4 were undecided.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no group closer to the grassroots of our country than the newspapers, television stations, and radio stations. They literally live with the people. This is overwhelming opposition to Federal aid in one of the States which would receive the most Federal aid. May I plead with my colleagues who represent States which will lose money under Federal Aid? Please do not tax your people to give my people something we are bitterly opposed to receiving.

All basic needs for Education are being met at the local and State level at a much faster rate than the advocates of Federal aid say is needed. Then what is the reason for the tremendous propaganda and agitation for Federal aid? It can only be Federal control of education and Federal empire building. The passage of Federal aid itself by this Congress will be dangerous education. It will immediately result in the American people looking more and more to Washington. It will educate the American people to lean here on a powerful central Government rather than to our time-honored institutions—the individual citizen, local and State government which is the foundation of our freedom. It will add hundreds of thousands more of our people indirectly and directly to the Federal payroll.

10119

June 21

Mr. Speaker, may I again plead with my colleagues not to turn the clock back to socialism, federalism, national brain-wash, and totalitarianism. Socialism and Federal control are old. These isms are decadent and were found wanting in the days of ancient Babylon, Greece, and Rome. Americanism is modern. Americanism is new. Let us continue to move forward with individual, State, and local responsibility which is the essence of refreshing progressive Americanism.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the so-called Federal aid to education bill will stay in the Rules Committee and will never come up.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am sorry to disagree with my good friend. I hope that bill comes out so that I can vote against it.

Mr. DORN. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. ULLMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to authorize the Crooked River project extension, which will provide needed additional reclamation facilities in Crook County, Ore. This extension of the Crooked River project will provide irrigation water to 2,890 acres of land adjacent to the present project. This is largely land which was formerly irrigated but was reverted to dry land due to lack of adequate water supply.

The additional facilities to be authorized by my bill, Mr. Speaker, have always been included in local plans for development and the Congress authorized in 1959 modifications of the central project works to make possible this subsequent extension. New works proposed to be built include pumping plants, canals, laterals, and drains. Construction costs on the extension are estimated at \$995,000, of which part will be repaid by the water users over a 50-year period with the remainder of the reimbursable costs being repaid from surplus power revenues of the Dalles Dam. A portion of the costs will be allocated to fish and wildlife purposes and thus will be non-reimbursable.

Enactment of the measure I have introduced will follow through on the action taken by the previous Congress in authorizing modification of the original Crooked River project. It will make possible the utilization of a part of the excess reservoir capacity being developed in that project. I would like to point out that the proposed extension has a very favorable benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.6 to 1 on the basis of a 100-year life. As in other desirable reclamation projects, authorization and construction of the Crooked River extension will represent another sound investment in our land and water resources. It will provide for greater stability and development of the area's economic base and for the utilization of presently unused land area.

A final report on this important project is under preparation now in the Department of the Interior and I hope that

the authorizing legislation I have introduced can be given early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

WILL AMERICA GO SOCIALISTIC?

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, some years ago Norman Thomas, six-time candidate for President on the Socialist Party ticket, remarked:

The American people will never knowingly adopt socialism, but under the name of liberalism they will adopt every fragment of the socialistic program until America will one day be a socialistic nation without knowing how it happened.

I am reminded of this quotation when I think of the housing bill which is to come before this body today.

NICK J. HALL

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of this body a signal honor bestowed this week on a young Michigan citizen. He is Nick J. Hall, age 17, of Saginaw, Mich., who has been elected Governor of the 24th Annual Wolverine Boys State, sponsored by the American Legion, currently convened at East Lansing, Mich. This is a great achievement for any young person; and it is one well deserved, as Nick has distinguished himself both at Saginaw High School, where is a junior, and in the community as well. He is also presently captain of the Saginaw High School football team. I am pleased to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a young man who has received such a noteworthy distinction and to commend those who chose him for their discernment. I feel certain that this honor will inspire Nick to continue to excel in whatever he undertakes and to be always a credit to his home, his church, his school, his community and his race.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 90]

Barrett	Hall	Powell
Blitch	Hébert	Rivers, Alaska
Buckley	Hosmer	Roberts
Burke, Ky.	Kearns	Rogers, Tex.
Carey	Kilgore	Roosevelt
Casey	Kirwan	Shelley
Cederberg	Laird	Staggers
Coad	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Corbett	May	Thompson, Tex.
Findley	Moulder	Van Pelt
Flynt	Norrell	Wright
Grant	Post	Young
Gray	Plicher	
Green, Ore.	Poage	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RESOLUTION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order any time next week to call up for consideration a joint resolution providing for the continuation of appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, this continuing resolution is the same thing we have had every year, so far as I can remember.

Mr. CANNON. It is the usual stereotype resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 350 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6028) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments

plish, then it is incumbent upon us to make certain that for every grant program there is a recognized national need which the program is serving effectively.

The present bill, while it is restricted to grants-in-aid which may be enacted in the future, may also serve as a prototype for similar legislation affecting programs now in existence.

Under the terms of the bill, any new grant-in-aid which Congress may hereafter enact would automatically expire at the end of 5 years, unless Congress specifically designated an earlier date or provided in the act that the program should be a continuing one. At the end of 4 years of the program, the bill provides that the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress shall undertake a study of the experience under the grant and determine whether to extend, terminate, or modify the program.

The present bill, Mr. Speaker, has a lengthy history. The problem to which it is directed was the subject of intensive consideration by our Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations during nationwide hearings on grant-in-aid programs in 1957 and 1958. In the subcommittee's report which was adopted by the Committee on Government Operations, we recommended that provisions similar to those in the present bill be incorporated in all new grant-in-aid programs.

Strong support for this position was provided earlier this year by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, an agency created by the Congress in 1959 and composed of representatives of all levels of government, of which I am a member. The Commission's study of the problem resulted in a recommendation to Congress that a general statute be enacted providing for a periodic, uniform and systematic review of new grant-in-aid programs. The bill I have introduced today carries the Commission's endorsement and is designed to effectuate its recommendation.

TRADING WITH COMMUNIST CUBA

(Mr. WILSON of California (at the request of Mr. CONTE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this appearance before you today is the third time in recent weeks that I have called to the attention of the House the serious problem that exists with respect to continued trading with Communist Cuba.

On March 10, 1961, I read into the RECORD a copy of a wire I had sent the President of the United States urging that he immediately invoke the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act that would completely eliminate all imports from Cuba. He has this authority within section 5B of Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917.

The reply I received, some 2 weeks later, advised that the President shared my concern and that he has the Cuban trade question under intensive study.

Again on May 17, 1961, when it was obvious that the study had not resulted

in action, I again wrote the President to urge that an Executive order be promulgated immediately to stop the importation of goods from Cuba.

Again 2 weeks later, I received a letter dated June 2, 1961, from the White House which stated that—

the Department of State and other interested agencies are now actively considering what further measures, consistent with our international obligations, should be taken to deal with the problem of Cuban trade.

Mr. Speaker, I have been hopeful and patient that the President would soon take direct action and would stop the sending of our dollars to Fidel Castro and would also allow our domestic producers to participate by fulfilling the needs of the Nation in what little gap may result by halting the importation of commodities from Cuba.

Today we find that the President has allowed the importation of some 2 million gallons of blackstrap molasses from Cuba. In response to the plea of our colleagues in the House and Senate from the State of Louisiana that this not be allowed, the President stated that he had directed his staff to look into the facts surrounding the shipment and that he had directed an aide to make a special report on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States should know by this date that action speaks louder than words and that his continued pronouncements that he has an intensive study underway, that the matter is being actively considered, that a special report is being prepared by an aid, and that his staff has been directed to look into the facts surrounding the shipment, must stop and a firm decision be reached to invoke the Trading With the Enemy Act. Continued delay and an unwillingness to make a decision on this matter has allowed, by conservative estimate, nearly \$25 million to flow into the Castro coffers.

It is my fear, Mr. Speaker, that the President is retreating with respect to Cuba and that this question may go begging for some time to come. As I noted in my earlier remarks here, the President first stated that this question was under intensive study, then he stated that they are actively considering what to do, and then today's press states that he has asked his staff to look into the facts and prepare a report. Now the copy of Webster's Dictionary in my office states that "study" implies great concentration and more attention to details and minutiae while "consider" often implies little more than applying ones mind from one point of view or in thinking it over; and, today someone is just looking the matter over. I say it is time to stop studying and considering and let us have more action from the White House on matters involving Cuba and for that matter the rest of the world.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why is the President stalling on this important matter. Why does he not make a decision? Why does he not stop the importation of these commodities? Why does he not stop talking and start acting?

BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION AT GREAT BARRINGTON, MASS.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the town of Great Barrington, Mass., is celebrating its bicentennial this year. Specifically, on June 30, Great Barrington will be 200 years old, having been established as a town by an act of the general court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1761. Actually, we have to go back even further, to April 8, 1726, to find the original grants of land for the settlement of Great Barrington.

Mr. Speaker, this was 6 years before the birth of George Washington. What a rich history and heritage Great Barrington has to treasure. Few areas of our great Nation, so far inland from the source of their settlers, were inhabited at that time. To venture this distance from established settlements required even more of the extraordinary spirit of our ancestors. However, if Americans should ever lose that spirit, our future will be limited; our days will be numbered. When we fail to push on into the unknown, or lose faith in our Creator, or desert the principles of individual liberty in a free society, then we shall have betrayed the mystic spirit of the founders of Great Barrington.

Little is known of the original Indian inhabitants of this particular area of southern Berkshire except that many of their relics have been found, unusually well preserved, proving their mysterious visitations and occasional villages.

The story of Great Barrington begins on the 30th day of January 1723, when Joseph Parsons and 176 other settlers in the county of Hampshire, at the time encompassing the area of the Connecticut River Valley within Massachusetts, petitioned the great and General Court at Boston for grants of two tracts of land in the southwestern portion of Massachusetts. By midyear their petition was approved. It provided for two townships, each 7 miles square, one having its southern boundary coincident with the Connecticut and Massachusetts boundary, the other to lie immediately to the north. These are the legal beginnings.

The people involved and the organization for settlement are stories as fascinating as historical novels. Col. John Stoddard and Capt. Henry Dwight, of Northampton, Capt. Luke Hitchcock, of Springfield, Capt. John Ashley, from Westfield, and Samuel Porter, from Hadley, were appointed to act as a committee for the division of the lands, for choosing and reserving lots for the first resident minister, and for setting aside properties for schools, meeting halls, and other community buildings. The committee collected, from the buyers, 30 shillings for every 100 acres of land to purchase the total tract from the Indians and pay the expenses of community development, erecting meetinghouses, and laying out lots. At an official meeting of the committee, called in Springfield on March 19, 1723, a total of 55 prospective settlers paid the prescribed prices and

testimony was taken from public officials at all levels of government. In general, the subcommittee found a favorable acceptance of the grant-in-aid method for obtaining intergovernmental cooperation in accomplishing national legislative purposes. However, it was felt and observed by the subcommittee that a grant intended to stimulate State and local action in a given field carries with it the serious hazard that it may resist termination once the Federal objective has been achieved. This tendency weakens the utility of the grant device and deprives the Federal Government of the flexibility needed for a sound grant system.

In its 1958 report on "Federal-State-Local Relations, Federal Grants-in-Aid"—House Report No. 2533—the Committee on Government Operations suggested a number of provisions which Congress might usefully include in statutes authorizing new or revised grant programs so as to clarify program objectives and the legislative intent.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was established in 1959 by Public Law 380 and of which I am a member, recently re-examined this problem and concluded that the most realistic approach to meeting it is through the enactment of a general statute providing for systematic review and assessment of grant programs which may be established in the future. My bill is intended to implement the Commission's recommendation in this connection.

While this bill does not apply to existing grants, the Commission has recommended that these programs also be assessed periodically by the Congress and the executive agencies in terms of first, accomplishment of the objectives set forth in the authorizing statute; second, an estimate of the extent of unmet need; and third, where appropriate and desirable, an evaluation of alternative plans or methods for achieving the program objectives.

In its report on this subject, which will be available early next month, the Commission recognizes that grant programs are presently subject to review by the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress and in the course of the appropriation process. In addition, the respective executive agencies give close attention to the operation of programs for which they are held responsible.

It is the Commission's belief, however, that the present review machinery would be strengthened by the enactment of a statute prescribing a systematic and uniform policy and procedure for the careful reexamination of new grant programs at stated intervals.

Under the proposed legislation, any new grant program hereafter enacted by the Congress would automatically expire at the end of 5 years unless an earlier date is specifically provided, or unless application of the act has been specifically waived in recognition of the intent to provide continuing Federal assistance in a given program. The bill provides that the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress shall, at the

end of 4 years, unequivocally address themselves to the question of whether or not a particular grant has served its purpose and whether it should be allowed to terminate or should be reenacted.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that since Federal grants-in-aid have become an established feature in our Federal system of Government, we must exercise the greatest possible care to strengthen their good points and to minimize any disruptive or undermining effects they may have. I believe this bill will help achieve that objective.

The bill that I have referred to is as follows:

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR PERIODIC CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATE AND LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. It is the purpose and intent of this Act to establish a uniform policy and procedure whereby programs for grant-in-aid assistance from the Federal Government to the States or to their political subdivisions which may be enacted hereafter by the Congress shall be made the subject of sufficient subsequent review by the Congress and the President as to insure that grant programs are revised and redirected as necessary to meet new conditions arising subsequent to their original enactment and that grant programs are terminated when they have substantially achieved their purpose.

SEC. 2. Unless otherwise provided by the Congress in the specific instance, any statute hereafter enacted by the Congress which provides for a grant-in-aid from the Federal Government to States or to political subdivisions thereof shall be subject to the provisions of this Act; *Provided however,* That this Act shall not apply to authorizations for shared revenues, or loans and repayable advances, nor shall it apply to any grant-in-aid statute now in effect, except that where a new category of grant assistance is incorporated into an existing statute, the provisions of this Act shall apply with respect to the new category incorporated.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever an Act of Congress enacted after the effective date of this Act provides for grants of funds from the United States to a State or a political subdivision thereof, the authorization for such grant shall expire on June 30th of the fifth calendar year which begins after the effective date of such Act unless an earlier date is otherwise specifically provided by law. Where such Act is extended beyond the date on which it would otherwise expire (whether by its terms or by reason of this Act) such extension shall expire on June 30 of the fifth calendar year which begins after the effective date of the Act making the extension unless an earlier expiration date is specifically provided.

(b) On or before June 30 of the calendar year preceding the year in which such program will expire by reason of subsection (a), the committees of the House and of the Senate to which legislation extending such program would be referred shall, separately or jointly, conduct studies of such program with a view to ascertaining, among other matters of concern to the committees, the following:

(1) The extent to which the purposes for which the grants-in-aid are authorized have been met.

(2) The extent to which the States or political subdivisions thereof are able to carry on such programs without further financial assistance from the United States.

(3) Whether or not any changes in purpose or direction of the original program should be made.

Each such committee shall report the results of its investigation and study to its respective House not later than March 1 of the calendar year in which the program is due to expire pursuant to subsection (a).

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. McCormack) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing for mandatory congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to State and local units of government. This is the kind of legislation, I believe, which can have far-reaching significance in improving our Federal system of government. It is also the kind of bill which all Members can conscientiously support, for its objective is to provide for systematic and effective congressional control of Federal aid programs. It is intended neither to encourage or discourage the use of the Federal grant-in-aid device, but only to improve it where it is found desirable by the Congress.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that several of our colleagues are joining today in introducing similar bills. On this side of the aisle the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] are sponsoring bills with me, while the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] and several of his colleagues on the majority side are also introducing the bill. I hope many others will join us later, for this is truly a bipartisan and constructive effort.

The need for this kind of legislation has grown—in fact and in public awareness—over the past several years. Congress has enacted at least 44 Federal grant programs, but aside from often routine review through the appropriations process there has been no systematic procedure by which the Congress determines whether the program is achieving its objectives, whether it should be redirected in emphasis, or whether it should be terminated or extended. As a result, some programs have outlived their usefulness while others could better serve the purposes of National, State, and local governments by undergoing periodic reorientation to meet changing needs. I would suggest, by way of examples, that grants-in-aid for resident instruction at land-grant colleges and for vocational education in agriculture are diminishing in importance while such problems as air pollution are generally increasing. Similarly, the various grants-in-aid for public health services should be reviewed and overhauled in keeping with the changing patterns of disease in the United States.

There is a further need for this legislation, Mr. Speaker, which arises from a growing discontent among the people at the apparent proliferation and continuation of grant programs which serve no important national purpose. If Congress is to protect the integrity of the grant-in-aid method and further the good which many such programs accom-

received their grants of land. I wonder how many Great Barrington residents are descendants of these 55 brave souls.

A month later, this same committee, to secure legal title to the land, met in Westfield with Chief Konkapot and 20 other Indians and paid the £460, 3 barrels of cider, and 30 quarts of rum. For these, then usual, items of payment, the representatives of the new owners gained a deed to a certain tract of land lying upon the Housatonack River, alias West-onhook. This area included what now comprises Great Barrington, Sheffield, Egremont, Mount Washington, and large portions of Alford, Stockbridge, West Stockbridge, and Lee. And so the land passed from its original settlers and natural owners to your ancestors.

In April of 1726, the now 59 proprietors took possession of their individual lands, collectively known as the Upper and Lower Housatonic townships. Time passed and the persevering qualities of those pioneering folks brought our way of life to reality in western Massachusetts. But soon it became apparent that some improvements in their government and social structure were necessary. While the people of Sheffield had the benefit of a church, a settled pastor, and schools, those 200 people living in the northern part of the town and the rural areas of the upper township had no regular religious teaching and few schools. For those people, these activities were the very center of their society—their lives revolved around their religion and education. They presented the General Court of Massachusetts with a petition to grant the upper township parish privileges. In 1742 the order was passed and these vital needs were satisfied.

Following the example of the territory west of the two townships, the new North Parish attempted, in 1760, to withdraw from the parent town, Sheffield. Although considerable opposition arose, a town meeting vote decided to set off the Upper or North Parish in the town of Sheffield, to be formed into a separate district or town. The following year it became official when the General Court passed an act, whereby, on the 30th of June 1761, the North Parish became a town, under the name of Great Barrington.

A colorful history. A truly American heritage.

Great Barrington grew with the Nation of which she became a part. Her contributions to our history are characteristic of our best traditions. She remained small in size, but if she had multiplied and bulged and spread over the land, most of her inherent charm would have been absorbed and certainly would have disappeared. Gone would be the annual town meeting and the entire form of government. She might have become just another city.

I know that my fellow Members of the Congress join with me in extending sincere congratulations to historic Great Barrington on the occasion of her bicentennial. All Americans can be proud of your past and the human experience it represents. The adventure in founding a way of life, in which you have played so leading a role, is not over.

It is just the beginning, and your part will be greater than ever before.

To quote from the selectmen of Great Barrington:

Two hundred years is a long space of time. However those before us must have taken their situation serious enough to build for the future. Let us, in their memory, do likewise, and in 1961, and all future years, build a better town for the coming generations.

So, to your citizens, our good wishes for a bright and valuable future.

EDWARD YELLIN AND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

(Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, National Science Foundation Director Alan T. Waterman is evading his obvious responsibility in refusing to terminate a \$3,800 fellowship to Edward Yellin and in referring Yellin's case to the Department of Justice for a determination as to whether Yellin has committed perjury.

Mr. Waterman's claim that he is powerless to cancel the fellowship because the law establishing the National Science Foundation states that fellowship selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability is ridiculous.

There can be no question about the fact that Congress intended this rule to apply only if there was no doubt about the loyalty of applicants or after all such doubts had been resolved in favor of the Government. This is proved by Congress declaration that the purpose of the act is to secure the national defense, by its stipulation that all applicants must sign an oath signifying their allegiance to the United States and their willingness to support and defend it against all enemies, and also an affidavit that they do not believe in, and are not members or supporters of, any organization believing in or teaching the violent overthrow of this Government.

Waterman's dodging of responsibility in the case also is attested to by the National Science Foundation's own policy statement that no fellowships are to be given or continued to any avowed or established Communist, or anyone convicted of a crime involving the Nation's security and that each applicant's integrity is to be weighed in the awarding of fellowships.

Today, the National Science Foundation knows beyond doubt that Yellin is identified as having been a member of the Communist Party and one of its colonizers in the steel industry; that he falsified his educational background and employment record in obtaining employment in that industry; that he stands convicted of contempt of Congress; that he concealed vital facts about his background in applying for a National Science Foundation fellowship; and that, even as he applies for a Government handout, he continues in his failure to make known to the Government the identity of enemy agents who may be

working today as colonizers in an industry that is vital to our defense effort.

How can the NSF claim that these facts are not sufficient grounds for it to terminate Yellin's fellowship? What more must it know to find Yellin lacking in the kind of integrity that must be expected of those receiving Government assistance for scientific research?

In referring the Yellin case to the Department of Justice for a finding of perjury, Mr. Waterman is passing the buck. One of the witnesses who identified Yellin as a Communist Party member was an undercover informant for the Department of Justice; it was the Department of Justice which prosecuted Yellin for contempt and obtained his conviction on that ground; it was the Department of Justice that successfully fought his attempt to have his conviction reversed by the Court of Appeals; and, if the Supreme Court decides to grant Yellin a hearing, it will be the Department of Justice that will argue the case before the Supreme Court.

There is absolutely nothing in the law which says that the NSF can cancel a fellowship only if an applicant is a convicted perjurer. Yet, by taking this step, Mr. Waterman is trying to make the American people believe that this is so.

The Committee on Un-American Activities gave the NSF information on Yellin's background on April 4. But it was not until late May, after Mr. Waterman had been invited to appear as a witness before the committee on May 23—and after a continuance of the date for his appearance—that the NSF finally got around to referring the case to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Waterman has demonstrated a singular lack of interest in protecting U.S. security despite his insistence, in his appearance before this committee, that he is just as interested in this as is the committee itself. For 10 long years, Mr. Waterman has operated under a law which, he now claims, does not give him adequate authority to keep subversives out of his program. Although he has frequently testified before the Congress during these years, he has not once pointed out this inadequacy or asked the Congress to change the law.

The testimony of Mr. Waterman and other NSF officials before the committee indicates that they have been bending over backward to do nothing in the security field. The NSF application forms for fellowships do not even ask if the applicant has even been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor. The forms supplied to those giving references for applicants do not ask if they have knowledge of convictions or any other information reflecting on an applicant's personal integrity, notwithstanding the fact that the NSF's statement of policy provides that—

In appraising a proposal [for a fellowship] the Foundation will be guided as to an individual's experience, competence and integrity by the judgment of scientists having a working knowledge of his qualifications.

Despite this, when Mr. Waterman appeared before the committee, it could not even get from him a statement that

such questions would be added to these forms. If all Government officials adopted this attitude, our security would be a horrible mess.

Yellin, now a graduate student at the University of Illinois, was awarded a National Science Foundation fellowship on March 15. He was convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions about party membership and activity in an appearance before the committee in February 1958—after he had been identified as a Communist Party member by two other witnesses, one of them an FBI undercover operative in the Communist Party. Yellin has appealed his conviction, which has been upheld by the court of appeals, to the Supreme Court.

A WELL-EARNED TRIBUTE FOR THE HONORABLE JENNINGS RANDOLPH

(Mr. HECHLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, at noon today an inspiring and heartwarming tribute was paid to a man whom I am proud and honored to call my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

The Lions Club of Washington honored Senator RANDOLPH today at a luncheon at the Mayflower Hotel to mark the 25th anniversary of the passage of the Randolph-Sheppard Act, which permits blind persons to operate vending stands in Federal buildings.

It is a privilege of the highest magnitude to be able to join in this tribute to Senator RANDOLPH for his role in the writing and passage of this humanitarian and marvelously effective piece of legislation.

Today, the Randolph-Sheppard Act has proved highly workable and offers the blind of America new opportunities for financial independence, a greater degree of self-respect, and a larger sense of contributing to the well-being of their communities.

During the past fiscal year, 2,078 of these vending stands were in operation in Federal and non-Federal buildings, with 2,216 blind persons engaged in operating them. They realized from this activity gross sales amounting to \$38,219,340, with net profits for the operators totaling \$7,541,304.

These figures have shown a steady growth each year since passage of the bill, and bear positive evidence of the practicability of the vending stand program for the blind.

The role of Senator RANDOLPH in this compassionate measure has been recognized by other groups in addition to the Lions Club, which has long been interested in programs of sight-saving and of assistance to the blind.

Part of the ceremony today consisted of the presentation of the Distinguished Service Award of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. This award, which was conferred by the committee's chairman, Gen. Melvin J. Maas, was presented to Senator RANDOLPH before more than 500 guests at the luncheon.

And in a special ceremony held in the Senator's office, B'nai B'rith presented Senator RANDOLPH with an award and a plaque, which bore this inscription:

In recognition of the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Randolph-Sheppard Act, bringing new hope and opportunity to the blind throughout the United States, and in appreciation of his steadfast devotion to the humanitarian needs of our country, we tender him this expression of our esteem and high regard.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH indeed has shown "steadfast devotion to the humanitarian needs of our country." While a Member of the House of Representatives, he was an ardent and loyal supporter of the vital social-progress and economic welfare programs which characterized the New Deal of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He has always been in the forefront of advocates of conscientious and forward-looking programs to develop, refine, and improve the human and natural resources of our great Nation. He holds the esteem, friendship, and deep respect of all West Virginians.

It is a deep honor and a heartfelt pleasure to be able to join in extending my personal congratulation to Senator RANDOLPH for his long and valuable career of public service, and to call the attention of this House to the richly deserved tributes which have been bestowed on him at this time.

HOORAY—WEST VIRGINIA GETS A CONTRACT

(Mr. HECHLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there is great rejoicing in West Virginia this week. The Marietta Manufacturing Co. of Point Pleasant, W. Va., has been awarded a contract by the U.S. Maritime Administration to build two or three survey ships for the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey at a cost of between \$3.7 million and \$5.5 million—depending on whether the pending Commerce Department appropriation bill provides for two or three of these vessels.

There are about 200 people on the payroll of this fine Point Pleasant firm, and this contract could mean tripling of its payroll over a 2-year period. This will be the largest contract with Marietta Manufacturing Co. since World War II, and I hope will signalize a dynamic new growth in the Ohio River Valley and in the entire State of West Virginia.

I would like to extend my congratulations to Walter Windsor, the able young president of Marietta Manufacturing Co., who came to Washington, D.C., and spent many hours both here and back and forth over the telephone from West Virginia in ironing out the fine details of the bid application and the terms of the contract.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress would not be able to do the jobs which they do were it not for loyal and effective staff members. All too frequently Members of Congress, because they are on the ballot on election day,

take credit for what their staff members do. I suppose that is all in the game. But in this case, I would like publicly to acknowledge that this particular contract probably would not have been awarded had it not been for the persistence, effectiveness, and ability to follow through which was displayed by my staff assistant, Paul L. Crabtree.

Mr. Crabtree made numerous calls, day and night, to Maritime, Commerce Department, and Coast and Geodetic Survey officials to make sure that the bid application was in proper form. He attended the bid opening in person.

After the bids were opened, it was discovered that a legal and administrative snag threatened to take the contract away from the Marietta Manufacturing Co., and Mr. Crabtree effectively "bird-dogged" this problem until it was solved after numerous conferences with executive branch officials. I am proud to have fine staff members like Paul Crabtree, a graduate of the Marshall University School of Journalism and former night city editor of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette. I am proud also of the other members of my all-West Virginia staff who have done so much to help our State.

The Washington Post recently carried a front-page article on the bid opening for these oceangoing vessels, expressing wide-eyed amazement that there was a shipbuilding firm in the landlocked State of West Virginia. The Post poked a little fun at what they termed a "dinghy of a shipyard." They related how the Marietta Manufacturing Co., which has fewer employees than most big corporations like Bethlehem Steel have vice presidents, caused a titter of laughter when this bid was read out to reveal not only round figures in dollars but also "17 cents." Yes, we have to figure things pretty close in West Virginia, right down to the pennies.

West Virginia got no special favors or special treatment on this bid, because the Marietta Manufacturing Co. was the lowest of 30 bidders. West Virginia thus is not getting this contract because Point Pleasant and the State happen to be in a distressed area with a high percentage of unemployment, and already has been designated as a distressed area by the Area Redevelopment Administration. West Virginia and the Marietta Manufacturing Co. simply outbid every other company from every other State.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to know that when we build oceangoing vessels on the Ohio River it is not like building a boat in the basement which you cannot get out. During World War II, Marietta Manufacturing Co. sent similar length ships down the Ohio River with barge escorts, but thanks to the improvements along the Ohio River initiated by the Corps of Engineers these oceangoing vessels can now go down the Ohio River on their own power.

The awarding of a shipbuilding contract to the Marietta Manufacturing Co. may herald the beginning of a new era of prosperity for the Point Pleasant area and West Virginia. In the past few years I have addressed the House on many occasions, pointing out that "West Virginia is being short changed." I hope

June 21

People who read more than just the comics in a newspaper. And people who take an interest in community affairs. These are the people who rule the United States. And these are the people who reserve the right to alter or abolish it. Yet the Constitution, almost 200 years old, has required only 22 amendments. It is certainly, as in the words of Gladstone, "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Unless we decide to do otherwise it remains as in the words of former Chief Justice Chase, "an indissoluble union of indestructible States." It is made indissoluble by the Constitution which also provides for the indestructibility of States by guaranteeing a republican form of government to each State. I say "republican," for you will not find the word "democracy" in our Constitution, or the Declaration of Independence or even the Pledge of Allegiance. We say "to the Republic for which it stands."

Article IV, section IV, of the Constitution reads: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a Republican form of government." We are a social democracy in that all men are created equal. But we are a political republic. In a political democracy everyone votes on everything. Mob rule. And a pure democracy leaves no place to fix responsibility. We often hear politicians say there is a public demand for this or that. There is sometimes a public demand for a lynching but that doesn't make it right. And there were those who publicly demanded the crucifixion of Christ.

Within the four walls of Independence Hall was established the first successful self-government in the history of the world. It is so, unique that it binds individuals and States together. But it limits the power of the States, thereby giving more power to the people. That power is voting. Did you know that every person in the United States votes? Yes, by what they do or what they fail to do they are voting. Edmund Burke once said that all that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing. That's a pretty big weapon. It can decide the fate of a nation and the world. For when the polls close on election night, the counting not only begins in the United States but also in Moscow. Our big, Red enemy is mighty interested in seeing whether we sat home on election night, for if we do it leads them just one step further in their belief that freedom has had it.

But freedom hasn't had it and the spirit of liberty still exists. It is that spirit which is not quite sure it is right, yet knows no better way. It is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of men and women. It is the spirit which lays its own interests alongside another without bias. And it is the spirit of Him, who almost 2,000 years ago taught the world the lesson it could never learn and could never forget: that somewhere, someplace, there is a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered alongside of the greatest. And this is the ideal of our living Constitution.

The Forgotten Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1961

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I received a most expressive letter

that is a reminder of the sacrifices of those brave men, who fought to save democracy in World War I.

I think it is time that we give them more and better consideration. Under unanimous consent I include the letter I received, and which moved me, in the Appendix of the Record.

I urge my colleagues to give attention to the legislation presently before the Veterans' Affairs Committee which would better compensate our World War I veterans for their great service to our country:

ANACONDA, MONT., June 5, 1961.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OLSEN: Why should not the remainder of the veterans of World War I, that vast Army that did so much for man, humanity, and country be recognized and receive a pension, if they elect to apply for it, during the few remaining days they have to live? Who in this land of the United States will object to the heroes of 1917-18 receiving a pension in their twilight year of life?

The flower of that great Army who are pensioned today and those now seeking the passage of H.R. 6847 are veterans who had no hospital record. They had nerve endurance and iron hearts. If unable to stand when the roll was called, they shouted "here". When the bugle called, they jumped into line with their comrades.

By night and by day, in sunshine and in storm, amid the smoke of battle where shells burst, and solid short mowed down their comrades, they stood firm beneath the crack of the enemy's rifle, the machinegun, the roar of artillery, the gas and quailed not at the imperiousness of their duty.

Almost every man who, for any time, participated in that terrible conflict of World War I and by exposure incident to the service exhausted his nerve force and physical strength, is now over 65 years of age.

When their duty in the war had been performed they went home with the same heroic determination to fight the battle of life that had made them the flower of the Armed Forces while in uniform. They asked no favors, but sought employment as best they could.

After a time the store of nerve force and physical strength they had become exhausted causing them to surrender. Men of iron, who were always at the front when cannon and machinegun talked, could no longer compete in the struggle of a busy life with those who stayed at home and enjoyed those comforts while they endured the exposures and the hardships incident to a soldier or sailor in uniform. Let us provide a pension for these men. Not one of these veterans should ever suffer for the necessities of life or be an object of local or individual charity.

If we are to relieve these claimants, alleviate their sufferings, and recognize the sacrifices they made, we must act while they live. It will not comfort them to visit the graves of their buddies with a flood of tears and a handcart full of bouquets. Aid them now and make dry those brave old warriors' cheeks now moist with tears born of suffering. Aid them with the necessities of life that will cheer them.

"Treasury Robbers," screamed the headlines in the newspapers after the war was over. There was never uttered a more infamous libel, a more wanton and barbarous attack upon any class of veterans than the assault upon the soldiers and sailors of World War I, by some newspapers, when the hostilities had ceased.

Beardless boys and young men, who were husbands and fathers, left their homes in

response to the call of President Woodrow Wilson, and the declaration of war by the Congress of these United States. Now these same heroes are aged, ill, suffering physical pains, and mental anguish. These veterans ask for an honorable pension and some sordid, heartless brute shouts, in a newspaper, "they want to rob the Treasury." Such creatures are destitute of patriotic impulses, dead to humanity, and barren of every shadow of love and gratitude.

We believe that there are no more worthy or deserving veterans whose names are not on the rolls of pensioners today, than the World War I veteran who was the father of a soldier in World War II or the Korean conflict. Mentally they suffered a million times more than the soldiers in the field. The veteran, father of the soldier in uniform knew the conditions, the duties, and the dangers of conflict with the enemy.

The great debt the Nation owes today is to the aged veteran of World War I, who are now in financial need, due to the high cost of living. It was reported that in March 1961 the living costs were steady at 127.5 percent of the 1947-49 base.

Many veterans of World War I cannot prove service-connected disabilities, despite being in the frontlines for 7 months. There were no records kept at the frontlines, no sick calls, no reporting for medical attention, no medical supply or material along the frontlines of combat. Most combat units lost their records during action and they were never again recorded when the soldier reported for disabilities, injury, or illness. The conditions of suffering, the hardships, and the exhaustion of night and day fighting for weeks at a time on the battlefields were never recorded on the soldiers service record.

In many cases the regiments never received any service records, supplies, or other stationery, until they returned to the United States from overseas duty. Then in the haste to demobilize the Army, made no attempt to complete any service record. That is one of the reasons that thousands of veterans who served overseas, during World War I, do not have any notations on their records that could or would prove that the veteran of a combat unit has a service-connected disability. The non-service-connected veteran that would benefit under this bill, H.R. 6847, has never received and has never been eligible for any benefits or gratuities since their discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States.

Sincerely,

ROBERT R. KLISKA.

Hon. John E. Fogarty, Member of Congress, Doctor of Laws and All the Humanities

SPEECH
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1961

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it is a very personal and particular privilege to join with the Members here in extending warmest congratulations to my dear friend, and our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, for the great academic honors most recently bestowed upon him by Brown University, Salve Regina College, and Brandeis University, and for those that he has so thoroughly merited in the past.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4669

But we think the matter was put more correctly in the blunt statements of Defense Secretary McNamara and Joint Chiefs Chairman Lemnitzer. Arguing for removal of present congressional restrictions on military aid to Latin American nations, they noted that huge amounts of Soviet-bloc arms are pouring into Cuba in order that Cuba can serve as a base for exporting the Red revolution to South America. "The danger," said General Lemnitzer, "is very great."

Until recently military aid to Latin America, which we have furnished, was a fairly foolish enterprise. It often meant adding to the glory of some dictator or other, or enabling one clique to knock off another, or one nation to start a border skirmish with another—none of which particularly affected the United States. That is why such aid is presently restricted; it can be provided only after a Presidential finding that it's essential to the security of the United States.

Today we confront a drastically changed situation. The threat of Castro—whose overriding ambition is to be the dictator of all Latin America, and he is only 33—is something new in the hemisphere. Never before has international communism had a whole country for a base in this part of the world, and it is being exploited to the hilt. Endless propaganda and subversive schemes and Red money pour from Havana, and Castro himself proved that it doesn't take a lot of arms to overthrow a regime. Castros are already busy throughout the area, trying to inflame the masses with visions of the Cuban "peasant paradise."

And let us not suppose the appeal is ineffective. To be sure, it is the old Communist bunk, but there are plenty of poor and gullible people in Latin America who figure they have nothing to lose. They are all the more likely to fall for it because they have no way of knowing what is really going on in Cuba and because rarely, if ever, have they been exposed to such an organized, well-financed onslaught. So there is no reason to dispute General Lemnitzer's description of the danger of the spread of communism in this hemisphere.

In these circumstances, it would be pleasant to imagine, as so many do, that economic and social reform and U.S. aid can effectively counter Castro's Communist subversion. If there were 100 years to spare, and if Latin America were blessed with wise governments, there might be hope of enough economic progress to blunt the Castro appeal. As it is, we face not only the appeal of the Castroite big lie. We face the fact that this is also an organized hemispheric conspiracy, based in Cuba and fed by the international Communist conspiracy. With or without popular support, it intends to topple existing governments and set up more Communist satellites.

That is an intolerable prospect for the United States. This country should not have tolerated the communization of Cuba, and if the U.S. Government had been effective it could have smashed the chain of conspiracy at its source in Castro and Cuban communism.

But surely, in the existing situation, it is not irrelevant to talk about arms. We do not advocate a massive draining of the Treasury to flood Latin America indiscriminately with arms. Any increase in military aid obviously should come from cutting back military aid to oversea nations long since able to provide their own defense, and from sharp reductions in the wasteful economic aid so casually thrown around the world, not to mention the reckless Federal spending at home.

What we do believe is that where a Latin American nation is aware of the threat of Castro-communism to its own security, is in danger from it, and is willing to resist, the United States should be prepared to give it any necessary military help. Indeed, we do

not see how the United States can do less. For if communism captures more of these nations, the United States may have to do something far more unpleasant.

President Kennedy, in his latest foreign-aid appeal on Friday, spoke again of the challenges around the world. Challenges there unquestionably are. But let us for once realize that some challenges—like age-old poverty in India—are possibly less important to the United States than the danger of Communist encirclement in our own hemisphere.

And let us finally stop looking at that immediate threat through the foggy glasses of future reform, and see it clearly and coldly for the combined military-subversive Communist aggression that it is.

Our Living Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1961

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call the attention of Congress to Miss Julie Zummo, a young lady from Norristown, Pa., who has exceptional oratorical ability.

Miss Zummo has won a series of honors for her art of public speaking. Some of these honors include first place in the Norristown Times Herald oratorical contest, first place in the eastern sector of the Pennsylvania forensic contest, third place in the annual poetry reading contest, and second place in the Pennsylvania State division of the American Legion oratorical contest.

In order to reach the State finals of the American Legion oratorical contest, she won first place awards in Montgomery County, in the Ninth District of Pennsylvania, in the southeastern sectional contest and in the eastern Pennsylvania contest.

Also deserving of recognition as Miss Zummo's adviser and speech teacher is Richard D. Alderfer, of Lansdale, Pa.

The following is the text of Miss Zummo's prize-winning speech entitled "Our Living Constitution":

OUR LIVING CONSTITUTION

Once upon a time there was an ideal. A very big ideal. So big that it strained the hearts of many men. After the war, with the fight won, they found their ideal lying wounded and dying in the bloodstained mud of the Revolutionary War. They raised it, bandaged it and brought it home. No matter what the American ideal must live.

From this resolve emerged the Constitution. But why did our forefathers establish such a document?

In 1620, a lonely ship set sail from a European port. There was a variety of people on that ship. They all came from different places, had different ideas. But they had one thing in common. They were searching for freedom. The freedom they never had at home. The freedom that some people are still looking for now. It is true, the sacrifices were great, but no government was ever to demand so much from its citizens nor would any ever give back more.

The colonists, realizing their hardships and abilities, became more self-reliant and found a need for self-government. With their fight won, they set about the task of

organizing a government. Philadelphia, a town of less than 30,000, was chosen as the meeting place. Delegates were sent from a group of impoverished colonies, colonies that had been governed by a Continental Congress, which had little power. They were suffering from too little power, while the rest of the world was suffering from too much power. This group of merchants, farmers, doctors, and soldiers were of substance and honor. It is true they were all young, but all were experienced in public affairs.

These men, chosen by their State legislatures, represented the spirit of the republican form of government at its best. No selfish ambitions or demagoguery entered their thoughts. When George Washington was elected to preside, the first order of business was a provision for secrecy. No TV cameras. Nothing could leave the four walls of Independence Hall so long as any member was still living. And do you know what else? They even had the road outside covered with dirt so the traffic could pass in silence. Thus these men were able to deliberate without interruption and to work uninfluenced by public clamor.

So a Constitution came from this Convention.

Fifty-three years later, Madison's notes were published by his widow. And the curtain rose on one of the greatest dreams in history. And now we know the secret. Now we know that there was no secret. These men of honor were hiding nothing but themselves. Removing themselves so that conflicting personalities and opinions would not mar the greatness of their document.

This document became the foundation of what is now a great America.

When the spirit of liberty was first conceived in 1787, the framing fathers wanted to make certain that no distinct class would rule. Therefore, they provided a government with three branches, legislative, executive, and judicial.

The legislature is known as the law making body. It is the people's voice in the Government. Everyone has a right to exercise their privileges and a responsibility to fulfill their duties. Our freedoms of speech, worship, and the press are never as great as they are today. Why within blocks of one another can be found churches of different denominations. At home, after dinner conversations can be held without fear of death or punishment. Conversations that run from state of the Union messages to senior prom decorations. These are all a part of the American way of life and no other way can compare to it.

The second branch of Government is the executive department. It enforces the laws set forth by the legislature. It makes sure that the Bill of Rights will be upheld. All religions are tolerated. We will not be thrown in jail for disagreeing with the President that we have elected. Opinions may be voiced over the radio, in newspapers, and among our friends but all are free from fear or punishment. For democracy is a free cooperation of thinking and acting people. It is not a better life but a way to one. It is a goal that we may never reach but will make us a better people for trying. It is a chance to succeed no matter what your race, color, or creed.

The third and last department is the judicial. Here laws are interpreted for the citizens. It is also here that our right of trial by jury is found. No one is guilty until proven so.

The heaviest part of America's burden lies not in the assembly lines of our great factories, nor in the inventive genius of our engineers. But rather in the quality of our daily lives. As you read the first three words of the Constitution you will find the authority by which the United States is ruled. "We the people * * *." Yes, people—common, ordinary, average people, but people who care enough to vote on election day.

miral Ricketts moved up his scheduled 1:30 p.m. address to the midshipmen at the Naval Academy to 11:30 a.m. and instead of dropping me off in Washington en route as was originally planned, we went by helicopter, land plane, and seaplane—another first for me—and dropped him off at Annapolis. I was brought to Washington from there and I have since learned that he returned to the Northampton immediately after addressing the midshipmen and was underway for Caribbean waters soon afterward. In the midst of jangling phone and the sparking and cracking of radios, the alertness and readiness of the seaborne first line of defense was clearly brought home to me.

The rewarding depths of participation Admiral Ricketts and I shared as well as the surge of inspiration culminating this visit will remain with me for a long time. I was so deeply moved that I cannot refrain from sharing my experience with you and encouraging others to visit our Navy ships and shore installations and meet first hand a segment of America dedicated to their job of preserving our way of life.

U. S. Policy on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Constantine Brown, in his article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on June 20, discusses the unfortunate situation created by the recent statement of the majority leader of the other body.

MANSFIELD MUDDIES THE WATER: SUGGESTION FOR COMPROMISE ON BERLIN VIEWED WITH DESPONDENCY IN EUROPE

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—Senator MIKE MANSFIELD's speech to the effect that we should consider a compromise solution to the Berlin question caused surprise and despondency in Italian, French, and German diplomatic quarters. While the Roman newspapers were uncommonly cautious in their evaluation of the majority leader's views, diplomats of the principal powers reacted as if somebody had hit them in the pit of the stomach.

President Kennedy and American diplomacy had registered a bull market in Europe after the Vienna Conference. Mr. Kennedy's report to the Nation (actually to the whole world) further increased the confidence of the NATO nations that America had ceased yielding ground.

According to informed sources in Rome, Italy's Prime Minister Fanfani was convinced after his talks with Mr. Kennedy that the President was adamant on the subject of Berlin, regarded by all the allies as the key to our survival.

Yet, for some mysterious reason, in the midst of the political honeymoon between the Western nations, Senator MANSFIELD chose to drop his bombshell. His explanation that this was his personal concept and had nothing to do with the views of the administration found no buyers. For even in this country of many parties and splinter factions, no parliamentarian of the party in office would choose to expound his own philosophy in such an important forum unless he had received the go-ahead from above.

Nobody, not even the most cynical of Rome's cynical journalists, questions Mr.

Kennedy's integrity. But they all wonder, sometimes aloud, whether one of his close advisers may not have taken it upon himself to extricate the boss from what the adviser considered a too rigid position and appealed to the Senate majority leader to do the job.

Premier Khrushchev's television report on his talks with Mr. Kennedy offered nothing new to those who have followed closely developments behind the Iron Curtain. Mr. Khrushchev stated last December that 1961 must see a peace in Europe by the solution of the Berlin problem (on the Russian pattern). In his television talk he merely repeated his position. What was not known last December was the attitude of the United States. This has been made amply clear by Mr. Kennedy's recent on and off the record talks and statements. But they have now been muddled by Senator MANSFIELD's expression of personal views.

The Kremlin diplomacy has been following, until the Mansfield speech, the expected pattern of aggressive talks about Berlin and an effort to further complicate the international picture by the activities of the Kremlin proxies. Trouble on a large scale is expected this summer in the Middle East and the Far East as well as in Africa with the accent on the Portuguese colony of Angola.

Italy, itself, has not been spared the attentions of Moscow. The present serious troubles in the Italian Tyrol (Alto Adige), a province ceded to Italy 40 years ago, is unquestionably inspired by Soviet agents who have many tentacles. None of the irridentist moves by the Tyroleans has any Communist tendencies. Quite the contrary; it is pure and unadulterated, old-fashioned nationalism. But, it is pointed out by sources other than the Italian Government (which cannot afford to insult the Communist Party—the largest in parliament) that the unprecedented violence of the new outbreaks has all the Moscow markings.

The Tyrolean people, stubborn but non-violent, have demonstrated in the past their discontent with being part and parcel of Italy. This despite the near autonomy they have been enjoying under the Italian republic. But never in the past—not even under Mussolini's repressive regime—have they adopted such destructive and violent tactics as they are now displaying.

The Vienna government which has raised the Alto Adige question in the last 2 years is not suspected by the Italian Government and security services, of having a finger in things. Who else, it is asked here, can derive the greatest benefit at this time from the possible chaotic situation but international communism? The agents are not talking Marxism but mere nationalism and offer the simple, honest Tyroleans the carrot of union with Austria. But to achieve this purpose, they are told, it is essential to cause much damage, shed blood, etc., in order to draw world attention to themselves.

This was done in Africa and in Asia and with spectacular success with the pirated Santa Maria which made Portugal's Salazar a household name overnight. Now the same tactics are being used in northern Italy against a country with an important NATO assignment—to guard the Mediterranean with the assistance of the other NATO members against a Red onrush.

There are at present indications that the Muscovites are also moving a large number of "refugees" to the borders of northern Greece in the hope of creating trouble for the stable and successful government of Premier Karamanlis. The list of potential trouble spots runs ad infinitum.

But nobody in the best informed quarters believed that the Russians would rush the Berlin case because, it was thought Moscow cannot afford a shooting war with the powerful West. And the West, through the

words of Mr. Kennedy, was determined to yield not an inch in Western Europe to Red imperialism.

But now some serious doubts have arisen on the ability of Mr. Kennedy to carry on this policy. These doubts are the result of Senator MANSFIELD's speech. His words may cause the Soviet Union to step up the Berlin solution long before it was expected to take concrete form.

The Broadening Activities of the Export-Import Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1961

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the much publicized "crisis" in the outflow of gold which was the source of great concern in the closing months of 1960 has brought to the attention of the public the necessity of strengthening the position of American exports in the world markets. In the reexamination of American policy which grew out of this concern, we have discovered that the program of export credit guarantees available to American exporters is far less broad or flexible than those available to exporters in competitive Western countries and that our exporters have consequently been working at a considerable disadvantage in relation to an already exceedingly keen competition.

Earlier this session I introduced legislation which seeks to alleviate this situation by strengthening and broadening the activities of the Export-Import Bank. I believe that the need for this legislation has not been better explained than by the Honorable George Docking, a Director of the Export-Import Bank. In a speech before the Council of Lake Erie Ports last month, Mr. Docking reviewed the present functions of the Export-Import Bank and the changes which he believes would be desirable. I commend this speech to the attention of all Members who feel, as I do, that the problem of raising the level of our exports is a vital concern for every American, both today and in the difficult years ahead.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY GEORGE DOCKING, DIRECTOR, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF LAKE ERIE PORTS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 23, 1961

THE BROADENING ACTIVITIES OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

In order to speak on this subject, it is necessary that I explain as briefly as possible the present programs and that I delve, although somewhat lightly, into the history of the organization.

The Bank was organized in 1934 and I have heard that the original loan was to have been made to Russia which had just been recognized by the U.S. Government. The Russian loan did not materialize and the Bank has never made a loan to that country.

The Bank is managed by a bipartisan Board of five Directors appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The

President appoints one Director as Chairman and President and another as Vice Chairman and First Vice President.

The law provides for an Advisory Committee appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Directors. The Advisory Committee consists of nine citizens, broadly representative of production, commerce, finance, agriculture and labor. The advisory members are paid on a per diem basis. This Committee has been meeting three times a year, twice when Congress is in session and once in the fall.

Other officers of the Bank, and these are not appointed by the President, are an Executive Vice President, a Senior Vice President, a General Counsel, a Secretary, and a Treasurer.

There are six main divisions, each headed by a Division Chief. These are the Legal Division, the Engineering Division, the Loan Division, the Private Capital Division, the Economics Division, and the Accounts Division. There is also an Administrative Division headed by an Administrative Officer.

I have given you an extremely sketchy outline of the organization of the Bank. We have reached the point of describing the work of the institution.

The Export-Import Bank law of 1945 outlines the general policies of the Bank as follows:

1. The Bank should supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital.

2. Loans shall generally be for specific purposes.

3. Loans shall offer reasonable assurance of repayment.

In all cases the Bank attempts to limit its advances to the purchase of U.S. goods—and, in some instances, services.

We shall not discuss at this particular moment the Bank's advances under Public Law 480, the so-called Cooley amendment, under which foreign currency loans are advanced to American subsidiaries, or to foreign firms in which Americans have a substantial interest, or to foreign projects which should develop markets for our agricultural products. These loans are important, and some possibly could be profitable for firms in your territory, but it is somewhat doubtful if they will be administered by the Export-Import Bank after this session of the Congress.

The other types of loans the Bank makes are (1) project loans, (2) balance-of-payments loans, and (3) exporter credits.

The project loans, also known as economic development loans, finance purchases of U.S. capital goods and other requisites for overseas projects intended to promote substantial contributions to the borrowing country's growth. These loans are extended both to private and public enterprise projects. In certain instances a loan may be made directly to a foreign government to help finance a national program of economic development. In these cases the foreign government allocates the dollar credit to specific projects which may be in either the public or private sector of the economy. These loans often have maturities up to 15 years and even longer.

Balance-of-payments loans cover emergencies in the borrowing foreign country. U.S. capital goods firms play no part in discussions concerning these loans, although they benefit from them to the extent that such loans enable foreign customers to repay outstanding dollar obligations or to maintain essential imports from the United States.

Exporter credits usually do not include transactions involving financing of less than 6 months as commercial banks are able to take care of these items. With respect to these short-term transactions, however, the Export-Import Bank does issue political risk guarantees at a reasonable rate up to 90

percent of the exporter's risk. These guarantees not only cover loss due to the more spectacular causes of riot, civil commotion, revolution, and expropriation, but they also cover the more likely, but less spectacular risk of the inability of the importer to transfer the payment to the exporter in dollars, due to actions of the foreign government. These guarantees are issued on what is called a "whole turnover" basis. The exporter must cover all of his export shipments on the particular kind of product. In other words, he cannot cover transactions in countries whose governments are somewhat unstable and not cover those in countries where the governments and currencies are well entrenched.

The Bank also issues political risk insurance on medium-term export credits, but each guarantee is handled separately and considered on its own merits.

Exporter medium-term credits—6 months to 5 years, and in certain instances, 7 years—may be handled directly with the exporter. In these cases, the importer must pay 20 percent down as a minimum amount and the exporter must carry at least 15 percent of the remainder of 80 percent of the purchase price.

The Bank, as an alternative, will issue its guarantee for its share of the loan, without recourse on the exporter, and the exporter will get the loan from a commercial bank.

A most important source of exporter credits is the commercial bank. The exporter and the bank originate the loan and the Export-Import Bank shares in the financing. The most commonly used percentages show a downpayment of 20 percent, the exporter's share of the loan of 15 percent, the commercial bank's share of 12½ percent, and the Export-Import Bank's carrying of the balance.

A commercial bank may carry a higher percentage of the credit and receive its payment, in that case, from the early maturities, leaving the later maturities to the Export-Import Bank.

Now that I have described—I hope briefly—the present activities of the Bank, I shall outline the changes in the program that we are working on at the present time.

A. Expansion of existing program: The Bank is prepared to expand its guarantee program for short-term transactions so as to provide an all-risk comprehensive guarantee on all types of products that may be legally exported from the United States to friendly foreign countries. At present the Bank offers coverage of political risks only on short-term transactions but does not offer coverage on the credit (commercial) risk involved in a transaction.

B. Guarantees from private institutions: The Bank proposes to make its short-term guarantee program available to exporters to the greatest extent possible in convenient locations throughout the country and, at the same time, afford private capital the maximum opportunity to play a greater role in financing the export trade of the United States. To these ends, the Bank has entered into negotiations with private institutions interested in issuing guarantees or insurance on short-term transactions to exporters, commercial banks, and others affording financing to exporters. These institutions include several groups of casualty insurance companies as well as other companies which are prepared to engage in the type of operation involved. The program envisaged by the Bank contemplates that these private institutions will issue their comprehensive guarantees or insurance policies directly to exporters or banks and others affording financing to exporters. The Export-Import Bank, in turn, will issue appropriate guarantees to those private institutions. If the Bank is unable to work out suitable arrangements with private institutions, the Bank will issue its own compre-

hensive guarantee directly to exporters or banks and others financing the exporters.

C. Medium-term exporter program: The Bank proposes to expand its medium-term exporter program, under which it furnishes financing or guarantees, to provide facilities as well as improved procedures intended to produce speedier action on credit applications. The Bank will:

1. Provide financing or guarantees for consumer durable goods as well as semifinished materials and products, provided that, as is the case in all of the Bank's operations, the items are sold on terms customary in the trade.

2. Provide financing or guarantees for equipment sold to government as well as private oil companies.

3. Consider lowering the Bank's requirements for the amount of cash payment by the buyer by the time of delivery, provided that the export trade demonstrates such change to be appropriate.

4. Give greater recognition to foreign competition confronting U.S. exporters in markets where heretofore, because of balance-of-payments difficulties of the countries involved or the magnitude of prior Bank commitments, the Bank has been reluctant to provide its assistance on an exporter credit basis.

5. Liberalize its criteria for credit judgments by proceeding to a greater extent on the basis of exporter experience and credit reports rather than on financial statements of borrowers.

6. Liberalize its procedures for giving advance commitments to U.S. sellers of equipment and contractors of services to the end that they may respond to invitations to bid in competition with foreign sellers and contractors.

D. Commercial banks: The Bank will endeavor to expand its program under which it participates with U.S. commercial banks in medium-term financing in reliance on the credit judgment of the commercial banks.

E. Coverage of items shipped abroad on nonsale basis: The Bank is now prepared to issue political risk coverage in the following types of transactions which heretofore it has not been prepared to cover:

1. On consignment pending sale to foreign buyers.

2. For display at trade fairs and exhibitions.

3. On lease contracts.

Cuba
Arms and Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Latin America and the current consideration of the President's foreign-aid proposals by Congress prompt me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, June 19, 1961. I think that we might do well in giving serious consideration to the thoughts expressed. The editorial follows:

ARMS AND LATIN AMERICA

A viewpoint commonly heard today is that the only answer to the spread of Communist Castrolism throughout Latin America lies in social and economic reforms heavily buttressed by U.S. economic aid. Arms, it is said, are not an answer at all.